

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 23, 2006. Claims 37-54 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 37-54 were rejected. In order to advance and expedite the prosecution of the present Application, Applicants amend Claims 37, 45 and 52. Thus, Claims 37-54 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 37-39, 43, 45, 50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,466,203 issued to Van Ee (hereinafter "*Van Ee*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 37, 45 and 52 are independent. Applicants respectfully submit that each of independent Claims 37, 45 and 52 are patentable over the *Van Ee* reference. For example, *Van Ee* appears to disclose an apparatus 100 having a display 102 for displaying graphical information, a frame buffer 112 coupled to the display 102 for storing information content shown on the display 102, and a modem 114 for connecting to the Internet (*Van Ee*, column 3, lines 44-66, figure 1). However, *Van Ee* does not appear to disclose or even suggest "a display refresh unit operable to read the graphics image data from the display frame buffer and display and refresh the image at a refresh rate" as recited by Claim 37, for example (emphasis added). Instead, *Van Ee* appears to disclose that when a web page is retrieved and displayed on the display 102 of *Van Ee* in its entirety, individual hyperlinks or text fragments may not be well discernible (*Van Ee*, column 4, lines 4-9). Thus, *Van Ee* appears to disclose that in response to a user touching a touch screen 104 of the display 102 of *Van Ee*, the portion of the web page associated with the touched area is zoomed-in (*Van Ee*, column 4, lines 10-19). Accordingly, *Van Ee* does not appear to disclose or even suggest a display refresh unit that displays and refreshes image content "at a refresh rate" as recited by amended Claim 37, nor does it appear to be necessary to refresh the image content indicated by *Van Ee* appear at any "refresh

rate" as recited by Claim 37. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that *Van Ee* does not anticipate Claim 37.

Independent Claim 45 recites "reading the stored graphics image data from the display frame buffer by a display refresh unit of the display device and refreshing the display of the image at a refresh rate" (emphasis added), and independent Claim 52 recites "means for reading the stored graphics image data from the display frame buffer by a display refresh unit of the display device and refresh the display of the image at a refresh rate" (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 37, Applicants respectfully submit that *Van Ee* also does not anticipate independent Claims 45 and 52.

Claims 38, 39, 43, and 50 that depend respectively from independent Claims 37 and 45 are also not anticipated by *Van Ee* at least because they incorporate the limitations or respective Claims 37 and 45 and also additional elements that further distinguish *Van Ee*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 37-39, 43, 45, 50 and 52 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 40-42, 44, 46-49, 51, 53-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Van Ee* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,024 issued to Robotham et al. (hereinafter "*Robotham*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 40-42, 44, 46-49, 51, 53-54 depend respectively from independent Claims 37, 45 and 52. At least for the reasons discussed above, independent Claims 37, 45 and 52 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claims 40-42, 44, 46-49, 51, 53-54 are also patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 40-42, 44, 46-49, 51, 53-54 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L. Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: September 21, 2006

Correspondence to:
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884